ECCLESIA LAW

ULTIMATE COURT CASE KILLER

26th February 2026

The global judicial landscape is increasingly confronted by a sophisticated evolution of the Organized Pseudo-legal Commercial Argument (OPCA) phenomenon, a movement that synthesizes fragmented legal principles, commercial codes, and maritime law into a distorted evidentiary framework.[1] This forensic report examines the emergence of these doctrines—specifically the "judicial fiduciary" theory, CUSIP monetization, and the "RES2" estate fiction—as promoted by entities such as Ecclesia Law, Empower The People, and MatrixFreedom.[1] By auditing the procedural and regulatory architecture of these claims, this analysis demonstrates their legal invalidity while contrasting them with legitimate, evidence-based strategic countermeasures, including spoliation of evidence motions and the doctrine of abuse of process.[3]

The Fiduciary Transposition: Deconstructing the IRS Form 56 Narrative

The foundational premise of many contemporary Pseudo-legal strategies involves the assertion that judicial officers and court administrative staff are operating as undisclosed fiduciaries over a trust res created by the litigation itself.[3] This theory posits that a judge transitions from a neutral adjudicator to a commercial trustee the moment they exercise authority over property, financial instruments, or estate interests.[3]

The Mandatory Disclosure Claim and 26 U.S.C. § 6903

Adherents of this theory, such as those following the "Ultimate Court Case Killer" manual, argue that judicial officers have a mandatory obligation to file IRS Form 56, "Notice Concerning Fiduciary Relationship," under the authority of 26 U.S.C. § 6903 and 26 C.F.R. § 301.6903-1.[3] They contend that the failure to perform this administrative filing constitutes "constructive fraud" and a "jurisdictional defect," rendering all resulting court orders void *ab initio*.[3]

The second-order insight suggested by this tactic is that it attempts to leverage the administrative weight of the Internal Revenue Service against the judiciary, effectively trying to "tax-trap" the court into a confession of commercial bias.[3] Proponents claim that by presiding over a case involving a "named estate" (typically the defendant's name in all-capital letters), the judge is administering an *ens legis* entity without the consent of the "living man".[3]

The Forensic Invalidity of Judicial Fiduciary Triggers

In legitimate legal practice, a fiduciary relationship is a relationship of trust and confidence that requires a specific legal trigger, such as an express trust instrument, a testamentary appointment, or a statutory

mandate for a receiver or bankruptcy trustee.[6] A judge's role is governed by Article III of the U.S. Constitution (or equivalent state and international authorities), which mandates impartiality and the adjudication of law, not the commercial administration of the parties' private wealth.[9]

IRS Form 56 is strictly an informational return used to notify the IRS of an existing fiduciary relationship so that the IRS knows who is responsible for the tax liabilities of an estate or trust.[6] It does not create jurisdiction where none exists, nor does it transform a public official into a private trustee.[7] The attempt to use Form 56 to "sever the relationship" between a sovereign citizen and their "strawman" has been repeatedly characterized by the judiciary as a frivolous misuse of administrative procedures.[7]

Triggering Event	Legitimate Fiduciary Basis	Pseudo-legal Claim (OPCA)	Legal Reality
Presiding over Probate	Statutory appointment as Executor/Administrator.[11]	Judge becomes trustee of the "Deceased Estate" by silence.[3]	Judge is an adjudicator; Executor is the fiduciary.[6]
Child Custody Orders	Best interests of the child; *Parens Patriae*.[3]	Court creates a "Minor Trust" for bond monetization.[3]	State intervention is a regulatory function, not a commercial one.[9]
Asset Forfeiture	Supplemental Rule G for Admiralty Claims.[3]	"Fraudulent Forfeiture" due to missing Form 56.[3]	Forfeiture is a law enforcement action against the *res*.[13]
Entering a Judgment	Authority to resolve disputes and award damages.[5]	Securitization of the docket via CUSIP.[3]	Judgment is a court order, not a tradeable security.[14]

Securitization Myths: CUSIP Monetization and the CRIS Illusion

A secondary pillar of Pseudo-legal strategy is the claim that court cases are "securitized" and "monetized" through the assignment of CUSIP numbers.[3] This narrative posits that judicial actors participate in a global financial scheme where legal disputes are transformed into bonded instruments and traded via Government Sponsored Enterprises (GSEs) or the Court Registry Investment System (CRIS).[3]

ECCLESIA LAW

The CUSIP-Linked Case Theory

The documents authored by Aaron Prince claim that if a court securitizes case instruments without proper disclosure, it violates federal securities laws, including 15 U.S.C. § 77e, § 77q(a), and 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5.[3] The core of this claim is the belief that every case file is a "financial asset" that the court "leverages" to obtain credit from the U.S. Treasury.[3]

This theory results in the deployment of "Writ of Quo Warranto" applications and "Notices of Interest" filed with the Secretary of State or UCC registries.[3] The intention is to establish a "commercial default" against the judge, arguing that the judge has an undisclosed financial interest in the outcome of the case due to the alleged monetization of the judgment.[3]

Technical Refutation of Case Monetization

The technical invalidity of CUSIP monetization is rooted in the fundamental definition of a security. A security, such as a bond or stock, must possess fungibility, liquidity, and be issued by a recognized entity for investment purposes.[14] A court docket is a record of legal proceedings; it has no market value and cannot be "cleared" through depository institutions like the Depository Trust Company (DTC).[18]

While the Court Registry Investment System (CRIS) is a real mechanism managed by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts (AOUSC), its function is to hold funds deposited in the court's registry (such as interpleader funds or bail) in interest-bearing accounts for the benefit of the ultimate prevailing party.[3] It is an administrative tool for the preservation of assets under dispute, not a platform for the "monetization" of human souls or the "bonding" of criminal indictments.[2]

Financial Instrument	Authentic Function	Pseudo-legal Claim
CUSIP Number	9-character identifier for clearing securities.[19]	"Tracking number" for a human being's value.[3]
CRIS Account	Holds registry funds in trust for litigants.[3]	"Secret slush fund" for judicial officers.[3]
Promissory Note	Legal promise to pay a debt.[18]	Negotiable instrument that "discharges" tax.[13]
UCC-1 Financing Statement	Public notice of a security interest in collateral.[17]	"Lien" against a public official for "dishonor".[3]

ECCLESIA LAW

The Linguistic Construct: "RES2" and the Estate Fiction

Pseudo-legal practitioners frequently utilize "Quantum Grammar" or "linguistic obfuscation" to argue that the court is operating on a legal fiction rather than the living person.[1] These manifests in the "RES2" theory, where "RES1" is supposedly the living man and "RES2" is the "ESTATE" or "strawman" construct created by the state.[3]

The "All Caps" Name and Estate Conversion

The "Ultimate Court Case Killer" manual explains that the court operates on the "ESTATE" (referenced as RES2), an artificial construct held in court-controlled fiction.[3] Adherents believe that by using an all-capitalized name (e.g., SIMON GOLDBERG), the state converts the individual into a "debtor entity" that serves as a commercial vessel for monetization.[3]

This belief leads to the use of unconventional punctuation in filings, such as ":::simon-goldberg::", and the application of red ink or blood-thumbprints to signify "living" status.[1] The goal is to refuse "joinder" with the legal fiction, thereby supposedly stripping the court of jurisdiction.[2]

The Judicial Reality of Legal Personhood

Courts have uniformly rejected the "all caps" name and "strawman" arguments as "nonsense" and "frivolous".[1] The legal system recognizes a single legal personhood for an individual, which encompasses their rights, duties, and liabilities under the law.[9] The use of capitalized names in court documents is a matter of administrative formatting, not a substantive transformation of the individual into a corporate entity.[2]

Legitimate Strategy: Spoliation of Evidence as a "Technical Knockout"

In contrast to the "word-soup" of pseudo-law, legitimate legal strategies rely on the rigorous application of procedural rules to ensure a fair trial.[3] A primary example of a valid, lethal strategic motion is the application for a strike out or dismissal based on the spoliation of evidence.[3]

Defining Spoliation in the Context of a Private Prosecution

Spoliation occurs when a party intentionally or recklessly alters or destroys relevant evidence after a legal duty to preserve it has been triggered—typically when litigation is reasonably anticipated.[21] In the specific forensic report regarding Simon Goldberg and Salim Fadhley, Goldberg allegedly bulk-deleted two years of his Facebook history on the same day he announced his intention to prosecute Fadhley.[3]

From a forensic perspective, this is a "Minister of Justice" failure.[3] A private prosecutor is not an ordinary litigant; they occupy a public-facing role with an absolute duty of candour and disclosure.[3] By destroying his own social media posts, the prosecutor destroyed the primary evidence required to determine if the defendant's conduct was a legitimate response to provocation, thereby rendering a fair trial impossible.[3]

The Consequences of Spoliation: Sanctions and Strike Outs

When a party is found to have spoiled evidence, the court has several potent remedies available:

1. **Adverse Inference Instructions:** The jury is instructed to assume that the missing evidence was harmful to the party that destroyed it (*Gatto v. United Air Lines*).[22]
2. **Monetary Sanctions:** In *Lester v. Allied Concrete*, the plaintiff and his attorney were sanctioned hundreds of thousands of dollars for "cleaning up" Facebook photos.[21]
3. **Strike Out / Discontinuance:** In criminal matters, if the prosecutor's tampering with the evidence file makes a fair trial impossible, the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) may take over and discontinue the case under the Evidentiary Stage of the Full Code Test.[3]

Case Law	Evidence Spoiled	Legal Outcome
Lester v. Allied Concrete	Facebook photos deleted at attorney's request.[21]	$700,000+ in sanctions; adverse inference.[22]
Gatto v. United Air Lines	Facebook account deactivated/deleted during discovery.[22]	Adverse inference instruction for jury.[23]
R v. Boyd	Failure to refrigerate blood samples.[26]	Stay of the indictment (Abuse of Process).[26]
Goldberg v. Fadhley (Alleged)	Bulk-deletion of Facebook history on day of prosecution.[3]	Probable cause for immediate strike out/discontinuance.[3]

ECCLESIA LAW

The Doctrine of Abuse of Process: Protecting the Integrity of Justice

A second legitimate legal strategy discussed in the provided materials is the "Abuse of Process" application.[3] This is an inherent power of the court to stay (permanently stop) proceedings if allowing them to continue would amount to an abuse of the court's procedure.[5]

The Two Limbs of Abuse of Process

According to the High Court in *R v. Maxwell*, there are two categories where a stay for abuse of process is appropriate:

1. **Limb 1 (Fair Trial):** Where it is impossible for the defendant to have a fair trial due to delay, loss of evidence, or prosecutorial misconduct.[5]
2. **Limb 2 (Integrity of the System):** Where it offends the court's sense of "justice and propriety" to try the accused, even if a fair trial is possible, because of the state's (or prosecutor's) bad faith.[5]

Abuse of Process in Private Prosecutions

In the case of *Morjaria v. Westminster Magistrates' Court*, the court found that seeking to pursue a private prosecution to impose "unjustifiable pressure" on an opponent during a civil mediation was a "truly oppressive" abuse of process.[28] Similarly, in *Muhammed Asif v. Adil Iqbal Ditta*, a private prosecution was stayed because it was being used as "leverage" for financial recovery rather than the punishment of criminality.[29]

The forensic significance for the Goldberg case is that Goldberg admitted to facilitating 1099-OID tax fraud filings.[3] Proponents of the defence strategy argue that a criminal enterprise cannot use the courts to enforce silence against those who expose the fraud.[3] This "Unclean Hands" argument, combined with the spoliation of Facebook evidence, creates a "pincer movement" that necessitates a stay of proceedings to protect the integrity of the justice system.[3]

The Art of War Philosophy: Forensic Logic vs. Pseudo-legal Distraction

Both the legitimate forensic analysts at Ecclesia Law and the Pseudo-legal promoters in the "Ultimate Court Case Killer" cite Sun Tzu's *The Art of War* as their strategic foundation.[3, 3] However, their applications of this philosophy are diametrically opposed.[3, 3]

Striking the "Achilles Heel"

Ecclesia Law's forensic Case Analysis focuses on identifying fatal structural weaknesses in a prosecution, such as a lack of *locus standi* or a regulatory breach (e.g., a prosecutor acting without a license).[3] This is a legitimate application of intelligence-gathering where the goal is to dismantle the opponent's right to bring the case.[3] The report on the Goldberg prosecution utilizes this by identifying the conflict of interest of his barrister, Gary Summers, under the Proceeds of Crime Act (POCA) 2002.[3]

If the funds paying the barrister are legally "Criminal Property" derived from a Ponzi scheme or wire fraud enterprise (EtP), the barrister's standing to represent the client collapses.[3] This is a "sniper shot" strategy based on technical, procedural reality.[3]

The Pseudo-legal "Pincer Movement" Failure

In contrast, the "Ultimate Court Case Killer" strategy attempts a "pincer movement" using fictitious obligations.[3] By combining "Commercial Defaults" with "Mandatory Fiduciary Disclosures," the adherent believes they can "establish default, reverse jurisdiction, and void all unlawful acts".[3] This fails because it relies on "fictitious obligations"—a judge is not a fiduciary of the litigant, and a court case is not a tradeable bond.[2]

The second-order insight here is that pseudo-law creates a "cycle of dependency" where the user is recycled through different entities as their legal situation worsens.[1] The "track record" of wins, such as the YouTube video titled "Lloyds Wipe £18690.00 Debt," often consists solely of emotional music and psychological manipulation without any documentary evidence of a debt discharge.[1]

Regulatory and Criminal Implications: The Global Response

The escalation of these schemes has triggered a coordinated response from international regulatory and tax authorities.[13] The IRS continues to issue warnings regarding the 1099-OID scam, noting that it is an elaborate scheme to defraud the U.S. government.[13]

The Internal Revenue Manual and "Badges of Fraud"

Under IRM 25.1.1.2, the IRS identifies "badges of fraud" that include the concealment of assets, underreporting income, and the failure to file required informational returns.[31] The conduct of the EtP syndicate—failing to charge VAT on services and concealing the monetization of fabricated "hidden credits"—meets these criteria, triggering potential referrals to the IRS Criminal Investigation (CI) division under IRM Part 9.[4]

Extradition and Judicial Scrutiny

The U.S. Department of Justice has successfully extradited 1099-OID promoters from Canada and Trinidad and Tobago to face trial, signalling that international borders do not offer immunity for these financial crimes.[13] In the UK, the High Court has increasingly used Civil Restraint Orders to prevent vexatious litigants from filing repeated, meritless claims that waste finite court resources.[9]

Regulatory Violation	Statutary/CFR Reference	Forensic Implication
Wire/Mail Fraud	18 U.S.C. § 1341/§ 1343.[3]	Transmission of void orders or fake OID refunds.[3]
Money Laundering	POCA 2002 / 18 U.S.C. § 1956.[3, 3]	Payment of legal fees with funds from fraud enterprises.[3]
Securities Fraud	15 U.S.C. § 77q / Rule 10b-5.[3]	Concealment of "case monetization" identifiers.[3]
Honest Services Fraud	18 U.S.C. § 1346.[3]	Depriving the public of a judge's unbiased adjudication.[3]

Synthesis and Forensic Conclusion

The pseudo-law concepts presented in the analyzed documents—Form 56 fiduciary triggers, CUSIP case monetization, and the "RES2" estate fiction—represent a sophisticated evolution of the OPCA movement designed to exploit individuals in financial distress.[1] These claims are legally invalid because they rely on fundamental misinterpretations of the nature of fiduciary duty, the administrative function of tax forms, and the constitutional role of the judiciary.[2]

The contrast with legitimate strategies is absolute. Legitimate forensic warfare focuses on "the professional integrity of the barrister," the "Minister of Justice" duty of the prosecutor, and the absolute Duty of Candour required to maintain the integrity of the justice system.[3] A prosecutor who bulk-deletes social media evidence on the day a case is announced has committed a material procedural violation (spoliation) that renders a fair trial impossible and provides the court with an immediate, technical reason to discontinue the case.[3]

Ultimately, victory in the "Art of Legal Warfare" is achieved not through the linguistic obfuscation of "Quantum Grammar," but through the rigorous application of existing procedural law. While pseudo-law promoters seek a "Technical Knockout" through fictitious obligations, legitimate forensic strategy secures victory by identifying and striking the genuine "Achilles Heels" of the opponent's standing and evidentiary file. The systematic suppression of syndicates like EmpowerThePeople is a necessary defence of the legal and financial infrastructure against organized commercial fraud.[1]

The forensic reality remains: no immunity attaches to fraud, and a prosecutor who destroys evidence or funds their case through laundered property collapses their own standing to prosecute.[3] The judicial system, equipped with powers to prevent abuse of process and address the spoliation of evidence, remains the final barrier against both criminality and the deluded theories of pseudo-law.[5]

ECCLESIA LAW

Works cited

1. Forensic Breakdown of the Empowerthepeople (Etp) Syndicate | PDF | Mail And Wire Fraud, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://www.scribd.com/document/997360263/Forensic-Breakdown-of-the-Empowerthepeople-Etp-Syndicate
2. Sovereign citizen movement - Wikipedia, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sovereign_citizen_movement
3. Ultimate-Court-Case-Killer.pdf
4. THE SUPPRESSION OF A MINISTRY DAN NEIDLE'S PROPAGANDA AND THE RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION OF IAIN CLIFFORD - Tax Policy Associates, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://taxpolicy.org.uk/wp-content/assets/THE%20SUPPRESSION%20OF%20A%20MINISTRY%20DAN%20NEIDLE%E2%80%99S%20PROPAGANDA%20AND%20THE%20RELIGIOUS%20PERSECUTION%20OF%20IAIN%20CLIFFORD.pdf
5. Abuse of Process | The Crown Prosecution Service, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://www.cps.gov.uk/prosecution-guidance/abuse-process
6. Instructions for Form 56 (12/2024) | Internal Revenue Service, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://www.irs.gov/instructions/i56
7. Sovereign Citizen Use of Documents, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/docs/Security%20-%20Handout%20III.pdf
8. Form 56 Filing Guide: Notice of Fiduciary Relationship for Founders (Enhanced), accessed on February 26, 2026, https://www.usehaven.com/blog-posts/form-56-filing-guide
9. Sovereign citizens: ideology, impacts and judicial responses, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://www.judcom.nsw.gov.au/publications/benchbks/judicial_officers/sovereign_citizens.html
10. IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS KEVIN E. BROWNE, Plaintiff, v. ROBERT SCOTT, et al., Defendants., accessed on February 26, 2026, https://ecf.ksd.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/show_public_doc?2019cv2167-10
11. Topic no. 356, Decedents | Internal Revenue Service, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://www.irs.gov/taxtopics/tc356
12. Sovereign Citizen Use of Documents - Association of Clerks of the District Courts of Virginia, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://vadistrictclerks.squarespace.com/s/DOJ-Reference-Guide-on-SC-Use-of-Documents.pdf
13. Simon Goldberg and Empower the People: selling US tax fraud, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://taxpolicy.org.uk/2026/02/25/simon-goldberg-empower-the-people-tax-fraud/

14. Monetisation - Scams in Finance - Intelligence | Trusted offshore banking & wealth management, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://www.if-bank.com/myths-and-scams-in-finance/monetisation/
15. Oct 21, 2024 By Email Vanessa A. Countryman U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission 100 F Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 205499 r - SEC.gov, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://www.sec.gov/comments/s7-2024-05/s7202405-533315-1529142.pdf
16. Evaluating Private Prosecutions, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://oars.uos.ac.uk/3369/1/Evaluating%20Private%20Prosecutions%20-%20A%20Case%20for%20Abolition%20v4b.docx
17. A QUICK GUIDE TO SOVEREIGN CITIZENS - UNC School of Government, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://www.sog.unc.edu/sites/www.sog.unc.edu/files/Sov%20citizens%20quick%20guide%20Nov%2013.pdf
18. Monetization - Corporate Products - Entities | Trusted offshore banking & wealth management, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://www.if-bank.com/entities/corporate-products/monetization/
19. Alleged Conspiracy to Extract Artificially Inflated Payments for CUSIPs - Kehoe Law Firm, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://kehoelawfirm.com/cusip-numbers-cusip-licensing-fees/
20. unclassified//for official use only, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/docs/courtroom_security__self-represented_litigants_-_handout_i.pdf
21. The Necessity of Social Media Forensic Preservation in Litigation | Magna Legal Services, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://magnals.com/the-necessity-of-social-media-forensic-preservation-in-litigation/
22. Delete at Your Own Risk: Spoliation of Social Media Evidence, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://www.wnj.com/updates/delete-at-your-own-risk-spoliation-of-social-media-evidence/
23. Facebook account deactivation leads to "spoliation instruction" | Technology Law Source, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://www.technologylawsource.com/2013/03/articles/electronic-discovery/facebook-account-deactivation-leads-to-spoliation-instruction/
24. Social Media and Spoliation – Can A Client Delete Her Facebook Posts? - Law Firm Defense - Sherin and Lodgen LLP, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://www.sherin.com/law-firm-defense/2014/09/29/social-media-and-spoliation-can-a-client-delete-her-facebook-posts/

25. Two Courts Sanction Plaintiffs For Spoliation of Facebook Evidence - Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://www.hunton.com/hunton-employment-labor-perspectives/two-courts-sanction-plaintiffs-for-spoliation-of-facebook-evidence
26. Abuse of Process, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://www.rahmanravelli.co.uk/expertise/general-counsel/articles/abuse-of-process-6/
27. Staying fitness to practise proceedings for abuse of process: A turning tide?, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://oldsquare.co.uk/staying-fitness-to-practise-proceedings-for-abuse-of-process-a-turning-tide/
28. Private Prosecution & The Abuse of Process - KANGS Solicitors, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://www.kangssolicitors.co.uk/news-insights/private-prosecution-abuse-of-process/
29. Private Prosecution Stayed as an Abuse of Process: Costs Recovered - 25 Bedford Row, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://www.25bedfordrow.com/site/in-focus/private-prosecution-stayed-abuse-of-process-costs-covered
30. Doctrine of Abuse of Process: Stay of Proceeding as Remedy for Illicit or Unjust Conduct, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://logreco.law/EN/criminal-matters/defence-strategies/doctrine-of-abuse-of-process
31. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION, Plaintiff, v. ELON MUSK, Defenda, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://assets.alm.com/46/47/b0c37b79408c89786cc3b2bf8b11/sec-motion-for-summary-judgment.pdf
32. Matrix Freedom - the scam conspiracy theory that makes £500k a month from the vulnerable, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://taxpolicy.org.uk/2024/06/08/matrix_freedom_scamming_vulnerable_people/
33. Misconduct in public office - GOV.UK, accessed on February 26, 2026, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/601bec27e90e0711cc85dd91/Misconduct-in-public-office-WEB11.pdf